

Question 20a: What level of commitment (# of staff, staff hours, local cost sharing, etc.) will your county dedicate towards implementation of this strategy?

Adams	30% of staff time (approx. 2000 hrs), \$0 for local cost sharing, as much LWRM cost sharing as needed
Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, Iron	?
Brown	Brown County will implement state standards that are consistent with existing County Ordinances: Animal Waste Management, Agriculture Shore land Management, Floodplains and Shore lands ordinance provisions related to Buffer Strips. All other work needed to conform to state standards will be conditional upon receiving staff funding from State of Wisconsin unless it is located in an active Priority Watershed Project(with staffing and cost share provided by state) and is an eligible practice.
Buffalo	Currently Buffalo Co. has only 3 full-time staff in the LCD office. (staff hours) Buffalo County's work plan for 2003 did not include any hours for implementation of NR 151. We would include hours for the implementation of NR151 in a future years work plan. (local cost sharing) Landowners receiving cost share funds for conservation practice work through the priority watershed program, LWRM Program (DATCP) and TRM Grant Program will need to provide their own match for the funds they receive.
Burnett	700 to 900 hrs and some purchased engineering assistance. We have a small c/s fund that may be used to supplement the state c/s dollars.
Calumet	We have a staff of 3. Our current workload exceeds our resources. We will do what we can to implement NR151 with these limitations. To commit staff hours to implementation of this strategy, we will need to ignore or drop some of our other activities or incorporate components of the strategy into them. We cannot estimate a level of commitment at this time. We do not have County funded cost sharing available at this time and probably will not have it in the foreseeable future.
Chippewa	County commitment will be directly related to State funding provided to implement this program.
Clark	10 percent.
Columbia	Unsure at this time. NR 151 will be used as a directive for our LWRM plan revision.
Crawford	Unsure... Willing to commit substantial time as laid out in L&W plan.
Dane	Do not know.
Dodge	Unknown how much we can do. Existing staff are fully committed to FPP, Priority Watershed Work, CREP, and administration of our manure storage ordinance. The future maintenance of our existing staff is threatened by our watershed project closing date on December 31, 2005, as well as the current county and state budget problems.
Door	Undetermined.
Dunn	I have two staff committed to the South Fork of the Hay River Watershed, two planners committed to FPP and FSA planning, one engineering technician, one planner committed to construction site, erosion control, storm water runoff management, nonmetallic mining, and mapping for comprehensive planning, one administrative assistant, one 40% receptionist that does a variety of tasks and a County Conservationist. Who do you suggest I have do all this work? In addition my state staffing grant was cut by almost \$23,000.00 for 2003. This means that in order to make up this difference we will have to become federal "Technical Service Providers". That's why with CREP, EQIP etc, we do not have time to provide enforcement support for this strategy. We are working with local towns to develop the agriculture and natural resource elements of their comprehensive plans which incorporates an inventory of their resources and provides an opportunity for education about the provisions of NR151, but I do not see where we will have the time to support a lot of the strategies without additional staff.
Eau Claire	What levels of financial commitment will the state guarantee us? What levels of flexibility will the state guarantee us so we can implement this in an efficient and cost-effective way?
Fond du Lac	Very little at this time. Other programs are our first priority at this time. However, these programs do accomplish some or all of the strategy being proposed. (FPP, Priority Watersheds, LWRM plan implementation, CREP, etc.)
Grant	Up in the air at this time due to budget constraints. Currently, do not have enough staff to implement anything new. (e-copy)

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

	Unsure due to budget woes. Currently do not have enough staff to administer the rules. Also, Co. Bd. Has a resolution against hiring staff-freeze at this point. (hard copy)
Green	Don't know.
Green Lake	If we feel that it is helping to meet our goals we will most likely be able to justify dedicating adequate resources to the cause.
Iowa	Unsure—budget dependent.
Jackson	3.6 staff as time is available.
Jefferson	Unknown. Workload will be tremendous and with the funding to do so will probably collapse under it's own weight.
Juneau	?
Kenosha	Due to budget constraints and limited staff it may be impossible for Kenosha County to provide additional assistance to landowners without increased funding.
Kewaunee	Unknown at this time.
Lafayette	That is hard to say. I can tell you that I don't believe the county will put on any additional staff, using county levy to implement this program. We do have our hands full at this time with our own priorities. I will be losing staff this year as well. We just can't be taking on any more at this time.
Langlade	Something the county can't do because of lack of funding and staff.
Manitowoc	At this time with current staff funding we could dedicate one staff person to this responsibility.
Marathon	The only cost sharing we have is watershed and LWRM related. We have work with our partners to use EQIP also. We presently have 7 ½ staff members funded by a variety of sources, including DATCP watershed and other, grazing grants, user fees, and county levy. This must be allocated for all Land Conservation Work in the county. It is difficult to give percentages to strategy or other work. It's all related one way or another.
Marinette	As long as the financial support from the state is sufficient, the equivalent of 1.3 FTE will implement this strategy.
Marquette	At this point staff hours/numbers would be limited, we are a small dept. as it is.
Monroe	Don't know at this time. We have had a county cost-share program for 25 years, but that could disappear if the budget situation is bad. If we do keep our county cost-share, I would be unwilling to make a commitment that we would use that to enforce the standards.
Oconto	Number of 2.5, staff hrs 1500, \$10,000
Outagamie	No estimates provided as we have don't know if we would agree to some or any of these tasks.
Ozaukee	Probably 1 staff.
Pepin	Unsure, current budget situations will dictate what we do.
Polk	The County is committed to the enforce our ordinances and fund them at level that meets our planned goals as defined within our LWRP. Staff 2 FTE
Portage	Depends on the priorities when we update our LWRMP.
Price	Whatever we can afford but I do know we can implement more efficiently at the local level. BUT you folks need to let us do our part and you also must learn to do YOUR part in this. No passing the buck. Stand up and be counted. (e-copy)
Racine	Unknown at this time. Our workload is at a point that we can't complete all our work now.
Richland	Depends on budgets. There will be no local cost sharing.
Rock	Staff funding from the state will dictate the level of commitment. (85 = 85)
Rusk	This is impossible to say at this point. One position was already cut from our staff and involvement in this process would require shifting our priorities significantly.
St. Croix	Depending on the level of financial commitment from the State?
Sauk	Estimate 0.5 FTE through 2004

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

Sheboygan	Unsure
Taylor	Our 2003 annual workplan has already been developed. At this time, we cannot devote any staff, staff hours, or local cost-sharing toward implementation of this strategy.
Trempealeau	We will dedicate staff as is available.
Vernon	If implementation becomes part of our regular cost-sharing, then we have 2.5 staff positions to work with. This may change if the county does not pick up 3 staff after the watersheds close. We have no local cost-sharing but we do receive a number of grants from private, federal, clubs etc.
Vilas	Cost-share program support; Conduct Information and Education Activities; and Some monitoring and reporting assistance.
Walworth	Not through local cost sharing. Already have local commitment of staff hours if funded by state with other programs.
Washburn	20% of staff time.
Washington	Our LWRM plan provides a framework for implementing standards in a manner fairly consistent with this strategy. Consequently, by committing to implementing our plan we are essentially implementing this strategy. <u>The pace at which we implement the strategy will largely depend on state funding.</u> Currently, we dedicate approximately 2 FTE's to working with rural landowners where compliance with standards is the main objective. Activities range from the planning and education through BMP implementation and compliance monitoring. This represents approximately 4000 hrs and \$110,000. Additionally, we will expend roughly \$6000 per year in local cost sharing. It is important to point out, however, that our time and financial commitments to implementing NR 151 are a result of locally-based priority rather than any state expectations. As a result, at any point in time, we may dedicate zero resources (local and state) to implementing this strategy, unless such work were conditions to a grant.
Waukesha	If current grant funds are not cut any more, we will likely commit 500 hours/year on this. Until we work out the details of our strategy, it is hard to give you any more than that. No local cost-sharing is available.
Waupaca	As stated earlier we have neither staff nor money to allocate at this time. The ball is in DATCP's court.
Waushara	Utilization of existing staff only.
Wood	At this time, don't know. Will do the best we can.

Question 20b: What level of commitment (# of staff, staff hours, local cost sharing, etc.) will your county dedicate towards other efforts to achieve compliance with NR 151?

Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, Iron	(same as 20a) ?
Brown	(same as 20a) Brown County will implement state standards that are consistent with existing County Ordinances: Animal Waste Management, Agriculture Shore land Management, Floodplains and Shore lands ordinance provisions related to Buffer Strips. All other work needed to conform to state standards will be conditional upon receiving staff funding from State of Wisconsin unless it is located in an active Priority Watershed Project(with staffing and cost share provided by state) and is an eligible practice.
Buffalo	Buffalo County currently has 3-full-time staff in their LCD office. (see {a} above) and based on the staff in the LCD office, the Land Conservation Committee and the county LCD office would need to decide where the LCD office will spend their time to meet the conservation needs of the county with the staff and other resources available.
Burnett	We are looking at participating in the non ag NR151 implementation as well but depends on how it works. Available time and money depends on what gets the most water quality improvement. Our time may be better spent on non-ag than ag
Calumet	Our technical and administrative activities in association with other programs and rules and with the voluntary installation of conservation practice will result in achieving compliance with some or all of the Standards and

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

	Prohibitions for many of our land users. Since these efforts are not solely dedicated to achieving compliance with NR151, we will not list them as so.
Chippewa	What other efforts will be implemented in the event the County chooses to not participate?
Clark	25 percent
Columbia	Not sure.
Crawford	Unsure.... Other departments cooperate in areas of mutual interest.
Dane	Do not know.
Dodge	(same as a) Unknown how much we can do. Existing staff are fully committed to FPP, Priority Watershed Work, CREP, and administration of our manure storage ordinance. The future maintenance of our existing staff is threatened by our watershed project closing date on December 31, 2005, as well as the current county and state budget problems.
Door	(same as 20a) Undetermined.
Dunn	We'll do the best we can with what we have!
Eau Claire	No commitment will be made at this time.
Fond du Lac	Currently we have 8.75 full time persons working toward the goals of ATP 50 and NR 151. As long as the county can maintain staff and have financial resources available, we are dedicated to achieving compliance with state standards.
Grant	(same as 20a) Up in the air at this time due to budget constraints. Currently, do not have enough staff to implement anything new. (e-copy) See 20a and in addition Co. Bd. will not administer state programs that come without funding to back up the adm. costs. (hard copy)
Green	(same as 20a) Don't know.
Green Lake	Unsure.
Iowa	(same as 20a) Unsure—budget dependent.
Jefferson	Unknown. Workload will be tremendous and with the funding to do so will probably collapse under it's own weight.
Juneau	(same as 20a) ?
Kenosha	(same as 20a) Due to budget constraints and limited staff it may be impossible for Kenosha County to provide additional assistance to landowners without increased funding.
Kewaunee	(same as 20a) Unknown at this time.
Langlade	(same as 20a) Something the county can't do because of lack of funding and staff.
Marinette	This must still be determined. It is my understanding that the DNR Region offices lack the staff and resources to implement EPA Phase II Storm Water Regulations. We will wait until the DNR's activity level is determined before making a decision.
Monroe	Don't know, too many unanswered questions.
Oconto	Really unsure this is way to early to estimate and I thought we answered that in question a)
Outagamie	(same as 20a) No estimates provided as we have don't know if we would agree to some or any of these tasks.
Ozaukee	½ staff
Pepin	Again, budget!
Polk	Dependent on outside assistance for staffing, one position = \$85,000
Portage	(same as 20a) Depends on the priorities when we update our LWRMP.
Racine	Without additional staff, we cannot take on additional work.
Richland	(same as 20a) Depends on budgets. There will be no local cost sharing
Rock	This will be outlined in the LWRM plan.

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

Rusk	We have not explored other strategies at this time.
St. Croix	With the current budget crisis, it is very difficult to commit additional staff time and county money towards any program until the more details are determined on state and local budgets. The devils in the details!
Sauk	Estimate 0.25 FTE through 2004.
Sheboygan	(same as 20a) Unsure
Taylor	(same as 20a). Our 2003 annual workplan has already been developed. At this time, we cannot devote any staff, staff hours, or local cost-sharing toward implementation of this strategy.
Trempealeau	(same as 20a) We will dedicate staff as is available.
Vernon	(same as 20a). If implementation becomes part of our regular cost-sharing, then we have 2.5 staff positions to work with. This may change if the county does not pick up 3 staff after the watersheds close. We have no local cost-sharing but we do receive a number of grants from private, federal, clubs etc.
Vilas	I&E activities.
Walworth	Not through local cost sharing (1 st hard copy). Already providing 100% for non-agricultural performance standards. (2 nd hard copy)
Washburn	50%
Waukesha	We are devoting almost three staff full time on non-agricultural issues.
Waupaca	Much of our time now is dedicated toward achieving compliance but we are doing it with programs such as EQIP, LWRM, Priority Watershed etc.
Waushara	(same as 20a) Utilization of existing staff only.
Wood	Same as 20a. At this time don't know. Will do the best we can.

Question 21: What suggestions would you offer to improve this state strategy?

Adams	More staff funding for all agencies involved
Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, Iron	Recognition that these issues are not necessarily at the top of the priority list for limited staff.
Burnett	Seems O.K. but sad you couldn't put all the 151 stuff together instead of just the ag portion
Calumet	Anything to reduce required record keeping. Develop a computerized system with online reporting if possible. Just keeping records of the compliance of every parcel and livestock site with each of the standards and prohibition in a county will involve a phenomenal amount of record keeping. GIS could enhance record keeping but not all counties have a fully developed GIS and not all LCD's access to GIS.
Chippewa	Determine and implement a dedicated funding source for County staff to do this work.
Clark	Provide staff funding to LCD's to conduct activities. Additional staff, both DNR and LCD, will be needed to implement this strategy.
Columbia	The plan seems to take an all or nothing compliance strategy. Counties may identify specific performance standards with higher priority and work on their implementation first.
Crawford	Make simpler, clearer and more direct.
Door	Increase State funding support for Counties that implement. Maintain a supportive role to the Counties that attempt to implement when the going gets difficult; as it will.
Dunn	I think this concept should be reexamined in light of the current budget shortfalls.
Eau Claire	Have a LCD committee develop components and DNR approve them unless there is a compelling reason not to. Have one (1) state staff person at the central office for review/concern. We do not need an undue amount of oversight

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

	<p>nor is there the funding for more state staff.</p> <p>Set goals, deadlines, etc. and meet them. The rest of us have to operate that way. This took over five years to get the Administrative Rule. . How long is this going to take?</p> <p>Set repercussions if the state does not meet reasonable deadlines and goals.</p>
Fond du Lac	Without staff and funding the strategy is nothing more than words on paper.
Grant	<p>More money for staff is number 1. Training on the actual implementation of rules and how the state sees our role in all this given the fact we cannot hire more staff. If we get more staff, then more cost sharing would be good. (e-copy)</p> <p>Staff #1. Secondly, better guidance to counties as to their responsibilities. (hard copy)</p>
Green	\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ for staff.
Green Lake	\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$
Iowa	Staff support (money) to counties is a must. And guaranteed cost sharing money available for landowners.
Jefferson	There is virtually no way to be timely or efficient with the current numbers of staff. More resources are going to be needed.
Kenosha	Increased staffing at the State and County level is the only way to insure the success of the new performance standards.
Kewaunee	None at this time.
Lafayette	There are still too many unanswered questions. It's a strategy, the only one I have seen at this point so I guess it sounds like it might work. I would just like to say one more time....our level of participation depends on staff and funding and the fact that our county does not want to do the enforcement.
Langlade	Something the county can't do because of lack of funding and staff.
Manitowoc	More opportunity to share in ideas, and techniques between counties.
Marinette	The strategy seems logical if the resources are available to implement it. My concern is that state dollars will not be available and that the strategy will be used to pull County staff and resources from County issues and priorities.
Marquette	Staff funding to counties to implement NR151
Monroe	Provide some money.
Oconto	This strategy questionnaire is way to complicated with good deal of the questions a guess. Nobody is going to know with any certainty on hours for staff, inventory time, enforcement commitment etc
Outagamie	Offer some choices or options that may be used to implement this program other than counties. Provide reasonable ideas on how this work might be funded. Provide some ideas as to reasonable dead lines, if there are any. Provide some ideas or open discussion on the role other agencies may play in doing this. This would include Federal agencies.
Ozaukee	I still have questions as to what the state strategy actually is.
Pepin	Trust the local conservation departments, they are the ones that will know what needs to be done to protect the environment in the counties.
Polk	The state needs to fund this activity at the level needed, presently there is not enough money. If you just matched county money dollar for dollar it still would not be enough. The overall concept of once in compliance, stay in compliance, should have been started 30 years ago.
Portage	The less reporting, the better.
Price	<p>The State needs to get tough! Ag is a business and conservation is a cost of doing business. Enforce violations of ordinances and laws! Up here water regs. Looks the other way as our lakeshores are being de-buffered. Zoning violations are rampant and the state ducks its responsibility to support, OPENLY zoning regs. This encourages the riff raff to challenge everything as a property rights assault. (e-copy)</p> <p>More staff, money, training. Make DNR/NRCS/FSA/DATCP consolidate, eliminate themselves for the most part and put control of money and programs in local hands. Taxpayers fund a hug overhead by allowing these agencies to "mostly fiddle around!" (hard copy)</p>

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

Racine	Provide additional staff and cost sharing.
Rock	Slow and steady.
Rusk	All the tools should be in place before we begin the job – (RUSLE issue, MOU's, lack of staffing).
Sheboygan	Unsure
Taylor	No suggestions at this time. However, this strategy stands a much better chance of being implemented if there is additional staffing funds connected with it. Also, for us it is a matter of timing. Our budget and workplan are already set for 2003.
Trempealeau	It appears that datcp does not want this program to be implemented and it appears as if dnr does not care if it is implemented. State staffing grants are not tied to the implementation of the states non point program. This program is a non starter which shall most certainly do what it was designed to do. Nothing. My advice would be to start over. Pathetic is the word that comes to mind.
Vernon	I would like to work with farmers on a voluntary basis first, and at the same time target individuals (like we do with NR243), this would keep us busy for a number of years. If we go to a watershed basis we may be spending a lot of time bringing farmers up to speed that may not make a big difference. This is what we saw in the Nonpoint watershed program. Sometimes ten farmers don't contribute as much as one farmer. We would prefer a targeting program.
Vilas	A staff person to carry out the strategy effectively.
Walworth	Need more local support for technical application. (1 st hard copy) Need more local support for technical application. (2 nd hard copy)
Washburn	Keep paperwork and red tape to a minimum... Provide enough funding to make program worth doing as far as \$ for projects as well as staff support.
Washington	It is comprehensive and well thought out. If there is anything in it that is not needed in order to have an effective and accountable nonpoint program in this state, I have not found it. For all its deficiencies, the Priority Watershed Program had a comprehensive implementation strategy. It's unfortunate that the entire redesign rule package is void of critical implementation details, including but not limited to who is going to do what, and by when.
Waukesha	The state needs to get serious about providing some automation tools (ArcGIS extensions) to Counties for inventory/compliance tracking and development of conservation plans. None of this is possible without these tools. State grants for staff and cost-sharing are also critical – or the whole strategy is a non-starter.
Waupaca	Dollars from DATCP
Winnebago	DATCP, DNR, NRCS and FSA need to demonstrate greater leadership than they have thus far in working together at the state level. That is going to be paramount to the statewide success of any rule implementation strategy. In addition, the strategy must be less 'heavy handed' in terms of inspections and 'enforcement' and place a greater emphasis on voluntary approaches, landowners incentives, and effective I&E at the state and county levels.

Question 22: Which of the components of this strategy do you feel should be conducted primarily by the state?

Adams	Enforcement
Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, Iron	Enforcement actions would be better handled by the state.
Buffalo	Notice of non-compliance and enforcement.
Burnett	Enforcement and litigation
Calumet	Components 2 [workload], 5 [enforcement], and 8 [notification of compliance status].
Chippewa	Funding and enforcement
Clark	All enforcement activities.

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

Columbia	Enforcement coordination, county DA and corporation counsels are already very busy. Their available time will dictate the enforcement potential we have.
Crawford	Enforcement
Dodge	Enforcement activities.
Door	Increased funding support
Dunn	If the state wants all these new programs ie. Nonmetallic Mining, NR 151 etc. the state should financially support them regardless of who is supposed to do the work.
Fond du Lac	Enforcement.
Grant	Enforcement ...in any way, shape or form. (e-copy) Enforcement. (hard copy)
Green	Enforcement.
Green Lake	Enforcement.
Iowa	Compliance in enforcement.
Jefferson	The vast majority. It seems this proposal is another "put more work" on the local delivery system
Kenosha	The present budget situation makes it difficult, to impossible for a County to make any level of commitment in the implementation of this strategy, we must rely on the State to be the lead agency until increased support is made available to county conservation departments.
Kewaunee	A major portion of the enforcement (along with the county's manure management ordinance).
Lafayette	ENFORCEMENT. Notifications. Development of the tools to do the inventory/compliance. Software for monitoring/reporting.
Langlade	Something the county can't do because of lack of funding and staff.
Manitowoc	Enforcement of final sites not following through with a compliance strategy.
Marinette	Enforcement and compliance record keeping.
Marquette	Unknown at this point.
Monroe	I doubt our county has the political desire to pass ordinances dealing with these issues, so the state will probably have to do the enforcement.
Oconto	The general education of the public and the explanation of "How nothing can be enforced without cost sharing".
Outagamie	Basic but consistent I&E and possibly enforcement.
Ozaukee	Unsure at this time.
Pepin	Maybe final enforcement actions for NR 151.
Polk	There is nothing wrong with the rule (NR 151), other than the cost of implementation, the local county is the best able to implement. Also, again funding is the short fall and a poorly written ATCP 50 rule.
Portage	Enforcement.
Price	All enforcement. All I&E publications. Anything else you won't pay for. (e-copy) All of it, unless there are huge changes. (hard copy)
Racine	All of the regulatory.
Richland	Notification and enforcement.
Rock	Enforcement
Rusk	With NR243, the DNR handled the official notifications and enforcement conferences. That worked well.
St. Croix	Enforcement, creating forms and Informational and Educational material.
Sauk	Enforcement actions.
Sheboygan	Refer to the previous survey questions with responses.

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

Taylor	We think that the County can certainly assist in this implementation strategy, but a majority of the workload should be conducted by the state.
Trempealeau	Enforcement when the county will not.
Vernon	Maybe the letter that is sent to the farmer saying they are out of compliance, much like we did with the NR243 program. Maybe my committee would feel different.
Vilas	We can assist in the following components: 1-3, 6-7, 9-10 = documenting implementation steps to be taken in our LWRM plan; aiding in educational and informational outreach; making cost sharing available as needed to install BMP's and providing technical assistance/administrative support in the installation of practices; some assistance with compliance monitoring; and some assistance with annual reporting. 4, 5, 8 = compliance, onsite evaluations, and enforcement should be conducted by the state--they are the regulators.
Walworth	Enforcement (both copies)
Washburn	Enforcement.
Washington	The DNR is ultimately responsible for water quality and thus the implementation of NR 151. As such, the DNR should be responsible for doing everything and anything in this strategy that no other agency is either willing or paid to do.
Waukesha	Enforcement
Waupaca	Anything involved with enforcement.
Waushara	All regulatory functions.
Winnebago	Statewide I&E, securing sufficient financial resources to get the job done, and conducting 'final enforcement', only as absolutely necessary.

Question 23: Are there any additional implementation issues (technical or policy) that you have not already mentioned?

Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, Iron	What is being done with NR 216 and other new rules to assist counties?
Burnett	What about the rest of 151, what is the implementation for that.?
Calumet	Available staffing resources in each county must be taken into account in the state-wide implementation strategy. Many LCD's with small staffs are already overwhelmed with their current workloads.
Chippewa	How will Federal cost-share funding and staff be used?
Columbia	Not at this time.
Dunn	All these additional policies do is take time away from implementing conservation on the land.
Fond du Lac	No.
Grant	What models will be used to determine compliance/non-compliance. i.e., soil prediction model, standards, etc. Need to be consistent and specific assessment tools that everyone can use in the same manner. (e-copy) Not that I'm aware of. (hard copy)
Green	What models do we use to determine compliance for statewide consistency?
Iowa	What BMP models will be used for compliance and they must be uniform.
Jefferson	Rough calculations : 1200 FPP participants x 1 staff member dedicating all available time to re-planning all the farms plans with RUSLE 2.... Will take in excess of 10 years. We are having difficulty grasping the size and scope of completing in a timely fashion.
Kenosha	None at this time.

Implementing Agricultural Performance Standards and Prohibitions

Kewaunee	No, not at this time.
Monroe	I suppose there is nothing that can be done about this issue, but it is going to be tough to convince me to provide cost-sharing for the practices that require maintenance and/or "lost opportunity" funds. Nor do I see a need to pay someone to get down to "T".
Outagamie	The answers provided to this survey came about from a special meeting of the LCC and LCD. All LCC members and LCD staff were on hand and each question was discussed in length. As you can see from our answers, we have not said "no" on any issue. We support the idea of performance standards and are willing to assist our landowners, the County and the State in bringing our lands into compliance. We feel taking on some of these tasks would require a policy directive from the LCC and perhaps the County Board so it is an important issue to us. It is difficult to provide more direct answers to the questions as we lack the details to base such decisions. Like many others we have concerns about funding but even greater is our concerns that this program will need to have a sound plan for delivery and the support necessary, from "all" parties, to make it work. We feel the counties will be needed to deliver this program and we are pleased at the reports of the DNR's efforts to work with the counties to develop a system that can make this happen. We wish the same could be said for DATCP and some other agencies and it is because of these agency's problematic involvement that we have concerns over our involvement and the success of the program.
Polk	Yes, the non-ag implementation.
Rusk	It would be helpful if the LWCC bought into this program.
Sheboygan	Unsure
Taylor	None at this time.
Trempealeau	Don't get me going!
Vilas	Not at this time.
Walworth	Scientific verification on the tools and models to implement these programs. Database monitoring provided by the state for reports. (1 st hard copy) Tools to implement program (2 nd hard copy)
Washington	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Washington County LCC is very interested in knowing which components and what level of time and resources the DNR is going to commit to implementing this strategy in our County. The LCC also wants to know if the DNR is going to stay committed to following through with the things they say they are going to do. <u>In return for having completed this survey, the Washington County LCC would appreciate a response to these questions ASAP.</u> 2) One significant issue is that there are practically NO incentives to implement the redesigned program. DATCP has none (as far as we can tell, we all get the same no matter what we do or don't do) and TRM multipliers are a joke. The pace that performance standards and prohibitions are implemented in WI will largely depend on state funding levels. The amount we get currently from the state is a pittance, and the state is lucky and should be grateful for the amount counties are willing to dedicate to the program from of their own local levy. The 2 FTE's we dedicate to this effort represent less staff than used to be dedicated to rural nonpoint work in past years. Consequently, we have actually decreased our level of effort towards nonpoint abatement. The redesign was supposed to accelerate nonpoint abatement efforts, but quite the opposite is happening. The pace will continue to decline as funding is cut and fails to keep up with inflation. 3) There are no timeframes or expectations for when any administrative function, much less compliance, is to be achieved. Without these (or at least goals) in place, how can the DNR or any county really plan its activities in manner that reveals anticipated costs or tells you whether or not adequate progress is being made?
Waupaca	Everything on the farm revolves around profitability---we will never force a grain farmer to grow alfalfa in his rotation if neither the market nor the federal programs support that crop. In the same vein, we cannot expect farmers to spend money they don't have regardless of the standards or enforcement. We don't anticipate that there will be much of a problem in Waupaca County but from my experience many farmers in Southwest Wisconsin cannot comply.
Winnebago	None at this time, however, thanks for taking the initiative to conduct the survey. We trust our responses will be useful.